

OS  
763  
1272  
767  
v.73

An Address...to Luke Scraf-  
ton, Esq; in Reply to his Pam-  
phlet, Intituled, Observations  
on Mr. Vansittart's Narrative.

By  
John Zephaniah Holwell, Esq.

A

0000176750



UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY

For Reading Room Only

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
AT LOS ANGELES











A N  
A D D R E S S

F R O M

JOHN ZEPHANIAH HOLWELL, Esq;

T O

LUKE SCRAFTON, Esq;

In reply to his Pamphlet, intituled,

O B S E R V A T I O N S

O N

Mr. VANSITTART's NARRATIVE.

---

L O N D O N:

Printed for T. BECKET and P. A. DE HONDT, near  
Surry-Street, in the Strand. MDCCLXVII.

[PRICE ONE SHILLING.]

UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA  
- LOS ANGELES -

ADDRESSES

FROM

JOHN SEPHANIAH HOWELL, ESQ.

TO

LUKE SCRATON, ESQ.

In reply to his Pamphlet, entitled,

OBSERVATIONS

ON

MR. VANSITTART'S NARRATIVE.

---

L O N D O N :

Printed for T. BAKER and R. A. DE HOND, near  
St. George's, in the Strand. MDCCLXXII.

[Price One Shilling.]

UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA  
- 37102 A 00112

2/35243 and

DS  
463  
A2P2  
1767  
V.3

[ i ]

TO LUKE SCRAFTON, Esq;

LIBRARY SETS

BEENHAM HOUSE; BERKS;

SIR!

January 14th, 1767.

OCT 10 1940

I CONFESS my obligation to you for your letter, without date, received yesterday, and accompanied by a printed pamphlet, entitled, "Observations on Mr. VANSITTART's Narrative," of which you avow yourself the author. Sorry I am that this singular production of yours did not come to my hands sooner; for if it had, be assured, Sir, you should not so long have imposed on the world, nor on the *circle of your own acquaintance*, without incurring the just chastisement of my pen, in return for the many flagrant calumnies, and injurious insinuations it contains against me. In all probability, you are pluming yourself with the thoughts that its poisonous effects have already answered your worst purposes, and wrought sufficiently upon the minds of others, before an opportunity

B

zamboni

portunity was given me of replying to it. Herein you may be mistaken; for thinking people are too considerate to determine on one side of the question, without giving a candid hearing to the other.

I shall not follow the unfair example you have set me, of picking out such passages only of my Memorial and letters as seem to make best for your purpose: the Public shall have your whole Epistle to me verbatim before them; while I take the liberty of commenting first upon it, and afterwards of refuting the misrepresentations and falsehoods contained in the pamphlet itself.

Letter from Mr. SCRAFTON to  
Mr. HOLWELL.

SIR!

“ Although I am not the author of the OB-  
“ SERVER, to which you have replied, I am of the  
“ accompanying Pamphlet, which never was pu-  
“ blished, nor designed to be circulated, had not  
“ Mr. VANSITTART thought fit to take upon him  
“ the character of head of a party, in oppo-  
“ sition.

“ fition to the present Directors: his activity in  
 “ that character, and some circumstances which  
 “ happened in April last, made it necessary, for  
 “ my own justification among the circle of my own  
 “ acquaintance, to make some observations on  
 “ Mr. VANSITTART’s publication; this led me  
 “ to disprove your Memorial, which my particu-  
 “ lar connection with Lord CLIVE enabled me to  
 “ do.

“ When you sent me one of your Historical  
 “ Events, I then wrote you, that I represented  
 “ your Memorial as false, or misrepresented, in  
 “ every instance; as also your Account of the  
 “ revenues, which has been productive of much  
 “ mischief to the Company, and is so totally false,  
 “ that besides the gross sum of eleven crore, be-  
 “ ing eight and a half crore more than the real  
 “ fact; the items it is composed of are ridicu-  
 “ lously false.—You rate the city of DACCA at two  
 “ crore.—The whole province, city included,  
 “ is but twenty-five laacks—the customs of the  
 “ city, I dare say, do not pass 40,000 rupees. As  
 “ you have thought fit to publish those things to

“ the world, you must take the consequence of  
 “ having gone on such wrong informations.

“ I am, Sir, &c.

“ CORNER OF UPPER-BROOK-  
 “ STREET, GROSVENOR-SQUARE.”

I cannot avoid looking upon the first paragraph of your letter as an awkward apology, flowing from conscious shame for your unprovoked attacks on the veracity of my Publications. What those circumstances were, which made it necessary for your own justification to insult Mr. VANSITTART, I am an utter stranger to : but where was the necessity, I ask, of wounding that gentleman through my sides ? and in such a virulent manner too, that your pamphlet would much more consistently bear the title of *An envenomed Invektive against Mr. HOLWELL's Conduct and Government*, than that which is prefixed to it ; and can you think, Sir, that the Public is so short-sighted as not to see through your weak plea of necessity for disproving my Memorial ? Alas ! Sir, the cause which stirred your  
 gall

gall against me is too recent to be already forgot; and the spite and premeditated malice which creeps through the whole of your performance, strongly mark the motives that dictated it, as I will manifest when it comes under my particular consideration: therefore you should have been more careful that you stood upon good ground before you began the assault, although supported by your boasted *particular connection* with LORD CLIVE,

I come now to your second paragraph; the whole of which is a rude undigested attack upon my Estimate of the real value of the BENGALL Provinces. Whether you are, or are not, the author of the EAST INDIA OBSERVER, N<sup>o</sup> 6. and 7. it is now pretty plain that paper has been broached under your *most significant* auspices, and that you have supplied the author with his scandalous anecdotes and materials; because the same charges are laid against me in that paper, N<sup>o</sup> 6. and nearly in the same words as they stand in your pamphlet: and in N<sup>o</sup> 7. about the time that you was penning your second paragraph to me, the Anonymous Author, in reply to my EAST INDIA OBSERVER Extraordinary, although foreign to his subject, aims a stroke at my estimate  
of

of the revenues to the same purport as yours. But that hireling is beneath my further notice: and had I received the smallest intimation that such a pamphlet as yours had been existing and circulated, that Tool would never have been the object of my Pen. Mistake me not, Sir, nor draw a conclusion from thence, that I think you an object more worthy of it: the vindication of my own character, from your now avowed aspersions, obliges me to wipe them off.—But to proceed with your second paragraph.

I well remember, Sir, that on the first publication of my HISTORICAL EVENTS, I had the honour of your superficial remarks on my estimates, and a menace, that you intended to publish a refutation of them and my Memorial, and of every thing else that I had published in my Vindication. — You well remember too, how I treated that menace; and told you, if you had wisdom, you would let it alone: which, it seems, you had not. On hearing you had represented to the Court of Directors my Estimates of the real value of the BENGALL Provinces as utterly false and without foundation, I was necessitated to explain myself, and support my

my assertions in a letter to the Court of Directors from Bath ; which letter I published as a Supplement to the second edition of the first part of my **HISTORICAL EVENTS**, a step I should not have taken, had the Court of Directors had the civility to acknowledge the receipt of it: to that letter I beg leave to refer the candid Public ; and although it does not suit with your purpose to understand me, it will be very obvious to the world, that my calculations arose not from the amount of what was, or had been actually and openly brought to account, but from the real produce and annual value of the lands and revenues of the provinces, which are sunk, embezzled, and dissipated in various shapes, and are not brought to the credit of the government at all. By analogous reasoning on facts lying before the Court of Directors, I founded my assertion, that the **BENGALL** Provinces would, on a strict general scrutiny and reform in the rents and revenues, and a new, although favourable measurement of the lands, produce annually rather above than under eleven Khorore.—Mr. Johnston's sensible and spirited letter to the Proprietors, affords the strongest support to my analogous reasoning ; for by that

Gentle-

Gentleman's indefatigable labours it appears; (page 9. of his letter) that in the district of BURDWAN only there were 412,491 acres of land lopt from the farms, to the annual value of 116,727 *l.*—That my assertion of eleven khorore could bear no allusion to the known public revenues as rated upon the Emperor's books, but on the contrary to the actual produce and intrinsic value of the provinces, on a general reform, is obvious from the constant tenor and bent of my arguments; for when I have occasionally mentioned the standing revenues, I have rather undervalued than over-rated them, particularly page 51 of INDIA Tracts, published February 1764, by BECKET, where (in my Address to the Proprietors) urging my reasons against the commander in chief of the troops having a vote in the committee or council, I conclude the paragraph in the following words: “ There will ever be one  
 “ set of political views in the cabinet, and another  
 “ in the camp; and this must inevitably be the  
 “ case; had it not been so, you would, in the  
 “ month of May or June, 1760, have been your-  
 “ selves SUBAS of BENGALL, and now in posses-  
 “ sion of between *two and three millions sterling per*  
 “ *annum.*”

“ *annum.*” Here I spoke without any retrospect to the knowledge and conviction I then had of the intrinsic worth of the country.—Lord CLIVE, in his letter to the Proprietors, published the same year, exceeds me by a million sterling; for his Lordship (page 16.) speaking of SURAJUD DOWLA, says,——“ His death soon followed, and “ MEER JAFFIER was in a few days in possession “ of the government, and of a revenue of three “ millions and a half sterling.”——Mr. Johnston exceeds his Lordship (page 16 of his letter before referred to :) speaking of the treaty with the young NABOB, successor to MHIR JAFFIER, he says, “ There remained with him, after “ the several allowances to be stipulated in favour “ of the company, a revenue of about two and “ a half millions sterling.” To this sum, if we add the monthly allowance of five lack, to be paid by the NABOB in lieu of troops, amounting annually to 812,000, the revenues of BURDCMAAN, CHITTYGONG, and MIDNAPORE, ceded by COSSIM ALY KHAN, estimated, the lowest, at 600,000 *l.* the twenty-four Purgunnahs, ceded by

JAFFIER KHAN, estimated at 100,000*l.* and Lord CLIVE's Jaggier (being the rents only of the 24 Purgunnahs) at 30,000 *l.* and the ZEMINDAARY of CALCUTTA at 16,000 *l.* we shall find the stated public revenues of the provinces amount to 4,058,000 *l. Sterling per annum*, which I believe is nearest the truth.—I advance these instances in proof of my assertion, that I rather under-rated than over-valued the stated public revenues of the provinces; and in proof also that when I pronounced the annual value of them to be 11 Khorore, I could neither mean nor allude to those (collected upon the present mode) but what they would with a moral certainty produce upon an easy detection of immense frauds, when the country was under a BRITISH government. On this position alone I staked my *credit* and *veracity*, and would as readily stake my head as a forfeiture on the issue, if ever my plan of a general scrutiny and reform throughout the provinces is carried into faithful execution.—Regarding what you say of DACCA, it is a known fact that the frauds and dissipations in

the lands and revenues of that district are more notorious than in any other part of the provinces.

You are pleased to allege, Sir, “ that my account of the revenues has been productive of much mischief to the Company :”—in the name of common sense, what mischief could accrue to the Company from having their eyes opened, that they might view in prospect the real value of the promised land they were entitled to possess ?

Thus much I have thought necessary to say in answer to your letter. I shall now proceed to your pamphlet, avoiding, as much as I can, a repetition of the pleas urged in my defence against the anonymous author of the EAST INDIA Observer, N<sup>o</sup> 6, in my EAST INDIA Observer extraordinary, published the 28th December last, which I intreat the public will do me the honor of keeping in their view.

The mean incense offered to LORD CLIVE in the first pages of your "Observations on Mr. VANSITTART'S Narrative," should have drawn no animadversion from me, had you not laboured to exalt his Lordship's character at the expence of truth ; if by *his successor* you meant me.—Page 6 of your pamphlet, you are pleased to say (in defence of a charge laid against his Lordship by Mr. VANSITTART) " it did not enter into LORD CLIVE'S " computation, that *his successor* should run up the " expence to almost double that sum ; nor could " he who had defeated the army of SURAJAH " DOWLA with three thousand men, conceive the " ENGLISH should ever keep up an army of fifteen " thousand !" — Let it in the first place be remembered, that howsoever happy in its consequences the *defeat at PLASSEY* proved to individual sufferers, the means by which it was obtained should rather be forgot, nor should you blazon that defeat with the semblance of a military act of prowess, which was solely owing to the treason and treachery

ot

of ROYDULLOB and MHIR JAFFIER, two of SURAJAH DOWLA's generals, the highest in office, as well as in the confidence of their master ; thus betrayed, no glory would have been reflected on our arms, had the defeat been atchieved with one fourth of the men then under Lord CLIVE's command.—

His Lordship's established character of a brave officer stands not in need of any false lustre to be cast upon it ; nor will you, I believe, Sir, receive his thanks for this wanton folly of your pen.—

Respecting your unwarranted insinuation against *his successor* in the above quotation, it was incumbent on you to have examined the general returns of the troops regularly transmitted to the court of Directors, and by comparing the general return delivered to me the 9th of February, 1760, with subsequent ones, you would have seen there was no augmentation of the troops worth notice during the term of my government, nor of expence neither, beyond what the exigences of the then very complicated nature of the service required.

In

In page 8th of your pamphlet, you are pleased to draw a conclusion in the following words :  
 “ Hence arose the distreffes of the SUBAH, and the  
 “ Company ; the provinces assigned to the Com-  
 “ pany became the feat of war.”——Now, Sir, you could have no motive for this conclusion, but the very obvious unworthy one of casting an odium on the conduct of Colonel CAILLAUD, the then commander in chief of the troops, which you without any just foundation had been labouring at in your two preceding paragraphs, page 7.—That the enemy was not pursued after the action of SEER-POOR, on the 23d February, 1760, was an accusation from which Colonel CAILLAUD most clearly exculpated himself. His pursuit could have answered no salutary end without cavalry, which was absolutely refused him by the young NABOB, although solicited for that purpose, in the most pressing terms. In place of that, or of immediately joining our forces, he shut himself in PATNA, until the 29th of February, on pretence of curing wounds  
 which

which a boy of ten years old would have been ashamed to own as such.——The SHAW ZADAH did not make his appearance in the BURDWAN country before the 15th or 16th of March, whereas Colonel CLIVE could hardly have cleared the BENGAL river, before SUBUT and his MAHARATTORS had possessed themselves of MIDNAPPOOR and other parts of the skirts of the BURDWAN; so that in fact it was at *this time* that the lands assigned to the company first became the seat of war, at least in all its effects; for such was the confusion, that a stop was put to all commerce on the bare alarm of SUBUT's advance. These destructive consequences might have been easily prevented, had the SOUBAH exerted the smallest degree of courage, or hearkened to my pressing instances to him on that occasion; for instead of ordering his troops (joined to a strong detachment of ours) under the command of his son-in-law COSSIM ALI KHAN, to march to the southward, and drive SUBUT out of the country, his pusillanimous fears prompted him to direct their

march

march to CUTWAH and the city; by which unfortunate measure the BURDWAN country was abandoned and left a prey to SUBUT and his MAHARATORS, to the irreparable disgrace of the SOUBAH's government, and damage of the Company. But this was not the only ill consequence which followed that measure; for SUBUT gained strength and footing daily in the country, and afterwards, by a junction with the BIERBOHEEN RAJAH, facilitated the SHAW ZADDAH's entrance into BURDOMAAN: whereas, had SUBUT been vigorously opposed in the beginning, and driven back, that district would have been freed from troubles; the receipts of our TUNKA's would have been uninterrupted, and the SHAW ZADDA would have had no encouragement to have made that sudden march to the southward, as we were afterwards well informed his chief incitement to that step, was the diversion which would be made in his favour by the MAHARATORS.—On the whole, Sir, I have made it clearly appear, that the distresses of the SOUBAH and  
the

the Company had their rise in BURDWAN, above a month earlier than the period you assign for them, and from a very different cause, to wit, the dastardly conduct only of your hero MHIR JAFFIER; and, I repeat it, you could have had no motive for *the conclusion* before quoted, but that unworthy one of throwing a reflection on Colonel CAILLAUD's conduct.

I come now, Sir, to your formal attack upon myself and government, beginning at page the 8th of your pamphlet; how well you have acquitted yourself in the execution, and how much to your credit, will appear in the sequel to *the circle of your own acquaintance* and the public.

You begin your assault in the words following.  
 " Throughout the whole of Mr. HOLWELL's government, we may trace the design of a revolution upon a bare examination, of what he thought fit to publish." In proof of this assertion, you quote part of my letter to Colonel CAILLAUD of the 11th of March 1760, and a scrap

of mine of the 21st of the same month to Mr. HASTINGS. The first of these quotations flatly contradicts your assertion; for there, I say, “ we must however support him and his government as long as we possibly can, without involving ourselves and our employers in his ruin;” if this implied a designed revolution, words have no meaning. — I wrote to Mr. HASTINGS in the same strain, ’tis true; but had you been either candid or just in your quotations or reflections, you would have given the public the last paragraph of Colonel CAILLAUD’s letter to me, of the 27th of February, to which mine was a reply, as well as those parts of mine which introduced the lines you disingenuously quote, and also the sentence immediately preceding that which you recite from my letter to Mr. HASTINGS. From these it would have glaringly appeared, that inevitable ruin must attend the SUBAH and his government, without a change and reform in his conduct and politics, which we had no reason to hope: and therefore I should have been little worthy the charge I then possessed, had I suffered my employers and the country to be involved in his ruin; and this necessary and just precaution you are pleased to construe into a premeditated design of a revolution, a charge which

which nothing but your own little malicious genius could possibly have suggested to my prejudice: for the passage, if discussed with candor and fairness, rather makes my conduct meritorious, than liable to censure.—You close page the 8th with saying, “ and in the same letter he accuses the “ SUBAH of engaging in a separate correspondence “ with the SHAZADA.”—And at the foot of the page you add a false note of reference to mislead the public, and send them a wild goose chase that you might more securely escape detection. Your note says, “ Vide HOLWELL’s Vindication, published by BECKET in 1760;” whereas the correspondence you make your quotations and remarks from, was published by BECKET in 1764, under the title of *India Tracts*, by Mr. HOLWELL and his friends; and the *Vindication* which your spurious note refers to (published likewise in 1764) was purely a defence of his character, (against an anonymous pamphlet put forth under the title of “ Reflections on the present state of our EAST INDIA affairs,”) in which you knew there was not a syllable contained of the correspondence with Colonel CAILLAUD or Mr. HASTINGS, which is now the subject of your remarks.—Blush therefore, Sir, at a procedure so unworthy. —

But once more to take up the thread of your pamphlet, which opens a fresh charge against me, and intimates my having falsely accused the SUBAH of a separate correspondence with the SHAW ZADDA; this you lay as a corroborating proof of my *designing a revolution*.

In support of this charge you quote (page 9.) my instructions to Captain SPEARS; and, lower, you say, I “come nearer to the point.” In my letter to Col. CAILLAUD of the 7th of April, part of which you also quote, (erroneously, or more likely intentionally, giving it a place in page 31 of my correspondence, instead of page 28.) and at the close of your quotation, page 10. you make the following profound remark. “This proves that  
 “Mr. HOLWELL was carrying on a correspon-  
 “dence with the SHAW ZADDA at the very time  
 “our forces were acting against him in the field;  
 “at the very time he is imputing it as a crime to  
 “the SUBAH, that he is engaged in the like cor-  
 “respondence; his own correspondence he ac-  
 “knowledges; but that of the SUBAH is attended  
 “with no such proof: for the following is an ex-  
 “tract of the answer from Colonel CAILLAUD,”  
 dated 15 April 1760, from DIGNAGUR.—Pray,

Sir,

Sir, how does this prove Mr. HOLWELL's correspondence with the SHAW ZADDA? He did not write himself to COMGAAR KHAN; he employed an emissary to him; if I thought I had sufficient grounds for giving credit to the intelligence given me of the SUBAH's *arzjee* to the Prince, was it not a duty strictly incumbent on my trust and station to trace out the fact? And had you not most unfairly suppressed the two last paragraphs of my letter of the 7th of April to Colonel CAILLAUD; (notwithstanding they immediately followed your quotation) my just causes for not doubting of my information, would have appeared most manifest. But this would have made against your insinuations.—The paragraphs I allude to are as follow.

“ I inclose you copy of a letter sent the OLD NA-  
 “ BOB by the Colonel, which I dictated to the  
 “ MOONSHEE by his order a few days before his  
 “ departure, on his being informed the NABOB  
 “ intended sending a *messenger* and *petition* to the  
 “ Prince.”

“ Whether this” (meaning the copy of the SUBAH's *arzjee*) “ is a real copy or not, I will not  
 “ say, though I firmly believe it true; that an  
 “ *arzjee* has been sent is allowed, but if it con-  
 “ tained

“ tained not matter detracting or injurious to us,  
 “ why was it sent without being communicated to  
 “ you by MHĪRAN, or to HASTINGS by the  
 “ NABOB?”

In my letter to Colonel CAILLAUD of the 9th  
 of April 1760, (page 30. of the 2d edition of  
 INDIA TRACTS, published by BECKET, 1764,) I  
 conclude with telling him, “ I have returned no  
 “ answer to the prince’s *phirmaund*, but have re-  
 “ plied to COMGAAR’s letter, and intimated to  
 “ him that I put no faith in copies, but that if  
 “ he would send me the SUBAH’s original *arzjee*,  
 “ I shall then be able to form a judgment.”——

This, Sir, if your intentions had been fair, you  
 would have referred the public to, as well as have  
 recited the purport of my letter to COMGAAR  
 KHAN, as transmitted to the same gentleman, un-  
 der date the 24th of April 1760, when you was  
 remarking from that very letter on such parts as  
 you thought made for your purpose of detraction,  
 which, since you have omitted, I must lay before  
 the public as it stands; p. 35. of INDIA TRACTS,  
 (2d edition) “ That I had received the *phirmaund*,  
 “ and pitied the Prince’s unhappy situation, and  
 “ misfortunes of his royal house; that he (COM-

GAAR

“ GAAR KHAN) was no stranger to the *ties and*  
 “ *obligations, which bound us to support* MHÎR  
 “ JAFFIER ALÎ KHAN *and his government*; that  
 “ copies amounted to no proof, but that if his  
 “ original *arzdasht* was sent me by the prince,  
 “ I should then know what judgment to form  
 “ of it.”

The extract of Colonel CAILLAUD's answer of the 15th of April (which you recite to invalidate the proof of the SUBAH's correspondence with the Prince, from the sentiments of Mr. HASTINGS) is equally disingenuous with all the rest of your quotations and remarks; or you would have set forth (or at least referred the public to) my arguments in refutation of those sentiments in my letter to Mr. Hastings of the 20th of April 1760, (p. 34.) and even the circumstances of my messengers being plundered at SEARPOOR of their returning dispatches from the Prince, as mentioned in my letter to Colonel CAILLAUD of the 24th of April, which you allude to, page 11, were to me a strong corroborating proof that the SUBAH's *arzjee* to the Prince was a truth, and no forgery, as pretended; but supposing the whole of what you call my correspondence with the Prince was minutely known

to the SUBAH, he could not, from the nature of it, have any cause or foundation for even surmising, much less "being convinced that a revolution" was then intended," (as you advance, page 12.) unless from the self-conviction of his own perfidy, and apprehension of it's being discovered.— On the whole, Sir, I do aver, that nothing but a deep and premeditated malevolence like yours, could have given the turn to this transaction that you have done; a transaction that bears not the least semblance of my engaging in any correspondence with the SHAW ZADDA, that tended in any shape to injure the SUBAH or his government, (but the very reverse) or that spoke *my design of a revolution*, which this charge is impotently brought forth to support; my intelligence originally was from a quarter I could not suspect of deceiving me. My duty to my employers, to myself, to the country, the perilous situation of our troops, and of our affairs in general, if such a wicked negotiation had taken effect, were all causes sufficiently alarming to stimulate my enquiry into the truth of it; and this enquiry was prosecuted with all the delicacy respecting the SUBAH's character, that the nature of the thing could possibly admit of.

From

From Colonel CAILLAUD's 2d paragraph of his letter to me of the 15th of April, (you took care, Sir, only to quote the first) it appeared to me that the SUBAH and his son had at that time a double game to play, either to make their peace with the prince and sacrifice us, or by treachery to get their lawful sovereign into their hands and murder him; I have a voucher by me that fully proves the latter; then why should we have the least doubt of his being capable of perpetrating the former? —“ One COMDARRY, duan to COMGAAR KHAN, engaged by letter to the SUBAH to put the Prince into his hands or cut him off, if the NABOB would agree to give him a lack of rupees, and the command of COMGAAR KHAN's country; these proposals being agreed to, they were transmitted to COMDARRY under the hands and seals of the two NABOBS, the 16th of April 1760, at night, from the camp at DIGNAGORE, when the two armies were not far distant from each other.” This negotiation needs no comment——As I had an early conviction of the badness of the SUBAH's heart, it was the duty of my post ever to be upon my guard against him, and therefore it was, that I thought it necessary to give the precautionary instructions to Captain SPEARS, which you recite, page 9. as evidence of my *designed revolution*.

You are pleased to say in page 12. “ Mr. HOL-  
 “ WELL puts the question more plainly to Mr.  
 “ CAILLAUD.”——If you mean any thing by *put-*  
*ting the question*, I suppose it is the question of a  
*revolution*, although in truth the quotation you  
 make from my letter of the 24th of May, con-  
 tains no question at all, but states matters of fact  
 only; and with your usual disingenuity, you sink  
 the close of my preceding paragraph, by which it  
 would expressly appear, that in the quotation you  
 make as *singly mine*, I was not only transmitting to  
 the Colonel my own sentiments, but the dictates  
 of the secret Committee——it is from thence evi-  
 dent it suited your genius and intention better  
 to calumniate me alone: — But since in your quo-  
 tation, page 12. you have thought proper to stop  
 in the middle of my paragraph, I will take it up  
 where you break off. —— “ The more we see of  
 “ this government, the more is verified your own  
 “ just observation at your first knowledge of it,  
 “ *that it is rotten to the core*; what then can be ex-  
 “ pected from a system rotten to the very heart  
 “ of it?——In every sense ruin must attend the  
 “ family, in spite of our efforts to save them, and  
 “ we must as assuredly be partakers in a less or  
 “ greater degree thereof; to say nothing of our  
 “ drawing

“ drawing our fwords in support of fuch a fyftem,  
 “ againft the legal, though unfortunate, Prince  
 “ of the country, from whom every advantage  
 “ and emolument we can wifh for the Company,  
 “ is tendered to us without limitation.” —

Thefe, Sir, you know were the sentiments of the Committee as well as my own; therefore, why did you give them to the public as fingly mine?— Here I confeß our design and wifh for the firft time was to divest this family of the government, as the fupporting them longer became utterly incompatible with the well-being of the Company and the country, as fufficiently appears from the deep diftreffes of both, fet forth without the fmalleft exaggeration.

Pages 13 and 14 of your pamphlet you make a long quotation from Colonel CAILLAUD’s answer (to mine of the 24th of May) which you think moft exactly makes for your purpofe, becaufe it contains the Colonel’s reasons, and difsent to our making a revolution *in favour of any other perfon*; —from a bare glance on the laft quotation, from my letter of the 24th of May, and the Colonel’s answer, it is moft evident he mifunderftood (I will not fay defignedly) the meaning and intentions of

the select committee, as there is not a word in the letter he was answering, that bore the least intimation of our having a wish to transfer the Subahship to *any other person* in the provinces. — Had the spirit of honor and candor possessed you, (of which you give me cause to say you have not a grain) you would have given the public my explanation of this matter, as it stands in my reply to the Colonel, under date 14th June 1760, (page 51. INDIA TRACTS) which is as follows. —

“ Had it ever been my wish or intention to  
 “ have taken our support from the present NA-  
 “ BOB, and transfer it to any other, your arguments  
 “ in that case would have all the weight with me  
 “ they so greatly merit; but I think on the repre-  
 “ sentations in mine to you, and the copy of mine  
 “ to Mr. AMYATT, you will see that was not my  
 “ aim, for I concur minutely with your objections  
 “ to such a step, and am very clear we should not  
 “ mend our situation by a revolution in favour of  
 “ any other, who would, as you truly observe,  
 “ prove as bad as the present, and probably worse;  
 “ but my views for the Company went much  
 “ higher. — That the country will never be in a  
 “ settled peaceful state, whilst this family is at the  
 “ head

“ head of it, is a position I lay down as incontest-  
 “ able; and that until the country enjoys that  
 “ state, the Company’s affairs must be daily ap-  
 “ proaching to certain ruin; I therefore judge we  
 “ could never be possessed of a more favourable  
 “ opportunity to carry into execution what must  
 “ be done, I plainly see, one time or other, (if  
 “ the Company have ever a secure footing in the  
 “ provinces) to wit, take this country into their  
 “ own hands, limiting ourselves to the province  
 “ of Bengal only, or extending our views to those  
 “ of BAHAR and ORISSA, as on future debate  
 “ might be thought most eligible.—The situation  
 “ of the Prince at present is such, that I am sure  
 “ he would readily and heartily hearken to any  
 “ overture from us, and without hesitation grant a  
 “ phirmaund, appointing the Company perpetual  
 “ SUBAHS of the province; his two phirmaunds  
 “ to me, as I before advised you, offered a carte  
 “ blanche for the Company, and I dare say that  
 “ to you was of the same tenor.”—— In a note to  
 page 10, you say the Colonel denied his having  
 received any Phirmaund from the Prince: where  
 he denies this I know not; I can only aver, so he  
 advised the select Committee, and promised to  
 send them a copy, which he never did; and it is  
 most

most improbable that I should refer to it, as I have done in my reply of the 14th of June, if no such advice had been sent. — Although it was my sincere opinion that there was a necessity for divesting this family of the government, yet it is plain I was not of opinion that they should be abandoned, how little soever they merited consideration; for in my last mentioned letter, page 53, I meditate a stipulation, that MHÎR JAFFIER and his son should be preferred *to some considerable posts* under the Prince, in case we entered into a treaty with him for the Subahdary of the provinces. All that I think necessary to add touching your long quotation from Colonel CAILLAUD's answer, is to refer the public to the whole of my reply of the 14th of June, and my remarks on the Colonel's letter, (page 50 and 51 of INDIA TRACTS.)

Page 14 of your pamphlet, you are pleased to say, with as little truth as manners, " July 1, " Mr. HOLWELL *invents a new calumny* against the " SUBAH still more improbable than any, viz, " that he is negotiating for twenty-five thousand " MORATTORS to enter his country."—To clear myself from this base aspersion, (which merits a *harsher name*) and to expose your talent at slander, must

must employ more lines than I at present wish, (could it be avoided) because I am impatient to come to your bungling dissection of my Memorial.

About the middle of June I first received advice from Mr. HASTINGS, the Company's Resident at MORADBAAG, of a prevailing report, that the SUBAH was negotiating a treaty with the MAHARATTORS, and on the 21st of the same month I received a letter from the above-mentioned gentleman, in which was the following paragraph.—

“ The NABOB seems much elated by this victory,  
 “ (over CUDDEIM HOSSEYN KHAN) but more so by  
 “ the late advices from DEHLI, which mention  
 “ that the ABDALLEE is obliged to retreat before  
 “ the VIZÎR, who has gained some considerable  
 “ advantages over him : the particulars have not  
 “ come to my knowledge, but the NABOB has  
 “ received a letter from the VIZÎR to this purpose,  
 “ and has had the news confirmed to him. The  
 “ VIZÎR's letter, I am told, the NABOB has an-  
 “ swered, and requested that 25 or 30,000 MAH-  
 “ RATTORS may be sent to his assistance, in order  
 “ to drive out the SHAW ZADDA ; and at the same  
 “ time MAUSALOODOE MHAMUT KHAN, and the  
 “ two MAHRATTOR VAKÎLS have received their  
 “ dismis-

“ dismissal, the first to remain at CUTTACK,  
 “ the latter to proceed to SITANAGUR, to forward  
 “ by their presence this motion of the NABOB’S.”

——I had but just received this intelligence from our resident, when a message was sent me from ROY DOOLUB, that he desired leave to pay me a visit; he came and brought RAJARAM HARKARAH with him. The purpose of this visit was to communicate several letters they had received the preceding night from their agents at the SUBAH’S Court, all relative to the step the SUBAH had taken of soliciting a body of MAHARATTOR troops from the VIZÎR, and the particular treaty he was entering into with the MAHARATTORS in consequence of his request to the VIZÎR.——These informations I laid before the members of the select committee, and it was resolved that they should be transmitted to the absent members, Messrs. AMYATT and CAILLAUD, the first time I had occasion to address them; but that Mr. HASTINGS should be wrote to immediately, which I did, in the terms following.

June 30, 1760.

“ The NABOB’S whole conduct put together leaves  
 “ us little room to doubt the truth of your infor-

“ ma-

“ mation, (touching the MAHARATTOR treaty) his  
 “ secreting from us his allies, (who at this very  
 “ juncture are saving his throat from being cut)  
 “ a treaty of such importance to us, and his coun-  
 “ try, pretty plainly shews his aim and resolu-  
 “ tion of being independant of us at any rate;  
 “ his scheme of being so by means of his friends  
 “ the Dutch, he finds there can be no firm  
 “ reliance on, but rather than not carry his point,  
 “ he will throw himself into the hands of a race  
 “ of people, to whom his country, government,  
 “ and family will in the end fall a sacrifice.—  
 “ Unless independence be his ruling motive to  
 “ this infatuated measure, the world must be  
 “ at a loss to divine what motive he can be sway-  
 “ ed by: the pretence of calling in 25 or  
 “ 30,000 MAHARATTORS to drive the SHAW  
 “ ZADDA out of the country, is the most bare-  
 “ faced one imaginable, and he might as well  
 “ openly declare his secret councils tend to  
 “ drive us out, as soon as he thinks he has the  
 “ power.”

“ If the treaty with the MAHARATTORS has  
 “ any real foundation, it has proceeded, on one  
 “ hand, from the art and influence of MAUSAU-

“ LOODEE MAHMUT KHAN; and on the other,  
 “ from the weakness, cowardice, and fears of the  
 “ NABOB, which are ever kept awake by the ver-  
 “ min about him, who inculcate, without ceas-  
 “ ing, that he has every thing to fear from us  
 “ only; however, be this as it may, it is highly  
 “ incumbent on you to get, if possible, at the  
 “ bottom of this treaty with the MAHARATTORS,  
 “ and give me, without loss of time, the most au-  
 “ thentic evidence of the truth of it, which you  
 “ can possibly obtain: ——— For I conceive our  
 “ very being depends upon sapping the founda-  
 “ tion of this union, and upon preventing, or  
 “ overturning every superstructure that can be  
 “ raised from it. Was the NABOB’s aim at inde-  
 “ pendence only, I think its consequence could  
 “ not much affect us; but if once those locusts  
 “ are introduced, and gain a footing, adieu to  
 “ the currency of trade, and then, what be-  
 “ comes of the Company and Colony? I am,  
 “ &c.” — An occasion offered to transmit the  
 particulars to Mr. AMYATT the 1st July, and  
 to the Colonel the 3d, — referring him to Mr.  
 AMYATT’s of the 1st. — Prior to the dispatch of  
 Mr. AMYATT’s, I had intelligence that the Su-  
 BAH had dropped his projected treaty, on hear-  
 ing

ing that I was informed of it, and the suppression of every overture towards it had been so effectual, that Mr. HASTINGS subsequently wrote, "He could not find sufficient grounds for the treaty;" but the solicitation to the VIZIR remained incontestable. What opinion the Public may form of the transaction itself, is at this time of day immaterial; it is sufficient for me, that I have stated known facts, which prove, that when you charged me with "*inventing this as a calumny upon the SUBAH,*" you was guilty of a base aspersion, which a Gentleman ought to blush at.

I come now, Sir, to your attack upon my Memorial, page 15, of your pamphlet, which you have been pleased, more than once, to stigmatise, as either "*false or misrepresented in every instance,*" with what regard to truth will presently appear.

The first charge in my Memorial against the SUBAH is, "his attempt to evade the terms of "the treaty:" (what impression of my Memorial you have copied from, I know not; but by false pointing, and leaving out the monosyllable *and*, you have made shift to make me speak flat non-

sense in part of my second paragraph.—Your quotation runs thus:—" The conditions of the  
 " treaty could not be obtained from the SUBAH,  
 " without, in a manner, being extorted from him  
 " by a thousand shifts and evasions ; &c." where-  
 as, the impression before me (Ind. Tr. p. 8.)  
 runs thus: " The conditions of the treaty could  
 " not be obtained from the SUBAH, without, in  
 " a manner, being extorted from him; *and* by a  
 " thousand shifts and evasions, &c."

Your remark on this charge allows it in fact;  
 for you say, " that the SUBAH would willingly  
 " have evaded the payment of a million sterling."  
 Was this a proof of his honesty, even to wish to  
 evade a condition of the treaty he had most so-  
 lemnly concluded? You add, " he *faithfully* com-  
 " plied with his treaty;" when? You answer  
 yourself,—when he found Colonel Clive's spirit  
 was not to be trifled with, nor imposed upon; so  
 that you are forced to acknowledge, that one of my  
*instances*, at least, is neither *false* nor *misrepresented*:  
 but to show, Sir, that your own recital bears  
 harder upon your friend JAFFIER than mine, you  
 will please to revert to your production before me,  
 p. 3 and 4, where you say, " ROYDULLUB was  
 " a GEN-

“ a GENTOO or native INDIAN, who had been  
 “ in high employment under SURAJAH DOWLA,  
 “ and was the only one in the secret of MEER  
 “ JAFFIER’s engagements to us, and in conse-  
 “ quence thereof, made very high terms with  
 “ his master, demanding for himself and his bro-  
 “ thers all the highest offices of the state.”—And a  
 very natural consequence it was, and what one traitor might expect from another. Don’t you know, Sir, that ROYDULLUB was not the only one in the secret? Don’t you also know that there was one more in the secret, *one* OMYCHUND, whose treatment, on that occasion, caused the deprivation of his senses and death? I beg leave to step over the paragraph of your own importance (p. 3.) and proceed to the next, where you own, that “ the SUBAH’s  
 “ first object was, how to delay or evade the pay-  
 “ ment of the sums stipulated by treaty for the  
 “ Company, half of which was paid, and the re-  
 “ mainder to be discharged in the course of three  
 “ years.—In this important circumstance, ROY-  
 “ DULLUB manifested so evident a partiality to the  
 “ Company, as, together with the exorbitant  
 “ power lodged in his hands, from the many em-  
 “ ployments, civil and military, with which he  
 “ and his family were intrusted, gave rise to a jea-  
 “ lousy

“ lousy which soon produced a crisis, &c.” A crisis indeed ! for we snatched him and his family out of the hands of your monster, just as the sword was at their throats.—Have I any where exhibited so detestable a picture of your hero as you yourself have in that paragraph ? The delay or evasion of the payment (the most pressing and essential article of the treaty) you say, was *his first object*.

The offices possessed by ROYDULLUB, he enjoyed too *by treaty*, as being a partaker in the SUBAH's treason against his master, and it ought to have been scrupulously observed (for traitors and rogues have a law to themselves;) but no sooner did ROYDULLUB *manifest a partiality for the Company*, than he was to be taken off.—How prevalent is truth ! How came you, Sir, in this *single instance*, spontaneously and unawares, to suffer it to drop from your pen ?

Your next attack is on the 3d and 4th paragraphs of my Memorial, where I assert, “ the officers of the revenues became our implacable enemies on account of the Tunkas (or assignment of the Lands) and that consequently a  
“ party

“ party was raised at the DURBAR, headed by  
 “ MHIRAN the SUBAH’s son, and RAJAH RAAGEE  
 “ BULLOB, &c.”—To the first part of my as-  
 sertions, your remark, p. 16, says,—“ This is  
 “ without the least foundation.” To the latter  
 part you aver, “ This is so very far from being  
 “ true, that this RAJABULLOB did, about this  
 “ time, propose to Colonel Clive the deposing  
 “ MEER JAFFIER in favour of SURAJAH Dow-  
 “ LA’s brother.” That the proposal was made, I  
 will not contest; because I know the man who pro-  
 posed it was capable of acting any double part,  
 however villainous; but pray, how does this prove  
 that my assertion against him and MHIRAN *was*  
*far from true?*—Here, Sir, you was not aware,  
 that at the time you think you are pointing your  
 envenom’d shafts against me only, you are charg-  
 ing your friend and patron, Colonel Clive, and  
 his whole BENGAL Council of the year 1760, as  
 well as the whole Court of Directors of the year  
 1764, with uttering and circulating the grossest  
 falsehoods.—The preamble of the Memorial trans-  
 mitted to the Court of Directors by Governor Clive  
 and Council, of the dispute with the Dutch at the  
 latter end of the year 1759, stand in nearly the  
 words following:—“ About this time twelve

“ months (about October or November 1758)  
 “ a *prevailing party at the* NIZAM JAFFIER ALI  
 “ KHAN’S DURBAR, *headed by* MHIRAN *his son,*  
 “ had prejudiced him to look with an evil and  
 “ jealous eye on the power and influence of the  
 “ ENGLISH in the provinces, and taught him to  
 “ think and look upon himself as a cypher, bear-  
 “ ing the name of SUBAH only! From subse-  
 “ quent concurring circumstances, it must have  
 “ been at that period, and from this cause, that a  
 “ private negotiation was set on foot between the  
 “ NIZAM and the DUTCH; that the latter should  
 “ bring a military force into the provinces to join  
 “ the former, and balance our power and sway.  
 “ The DUTCH, stimulated by envy, &c.”—The  
 Company’s printed Memorial to the King, signed  
 3d February, 1762, after specifying the establish-  
 ment of the SUBAH, takes up the matter and  
 sense of the fore-recited preamble, but in other  
 words, as follows (p. 9.)

“ After all this, and when the peace of the  
 “ country was re-established, and the NIZAM  
 “ quietly settled in that station, some of *the Dutch*  
 “ *factory,* (for we do not mean to impute to all,  
 “ what we believe many disapproved) *envying*  
 “ the

“ the reputation and influence of the ENGLISH  
 “ at the NIZAM’S Court, and hoping to find their  
 “ private account, in reviving the confusion from  
 “ which those provinces had been so happily ex-  
 “ tricated, *associated with others of the like disposi-*  
 “ *tion, members of the NIZAM’S Durbar, and parti-*  
 “ cularly with COJA WAZEED, a considerable mer-  
 “ chant, whose enmity to the ENGLISH will  
 “ hereafter be accounted for, endeavoured to  
 “ prejudice the NIZAM and his son, *to look with*  
 “ *an evil and jealous eye on the ENGLISH, insinuat-*  
 “ *ing that he was a cypher, bearing the name of*  
 “ SUBAH *only*, and that the ENGLISH were aim-  
 “ ing to be SUBAHS of the country, in breach of  
 “ their treaty with him.”

“ These insinuations, groundless as they were,  
 “ (since had the ENGLISH the design imputed to  
 “ them, what hindered them from carrying it  
 “ into execution, instead of supporting the NIZAM  
 “ in raising himself to that dignity ?) had at length,  
 “ being often repeated, so much effect, that they  
 “ inclined him to listen to their proposals; *one*  
 “ *of which was, that the DUTCH were to bring*  
 “ *into the province a military force to join his, and*  
 “ curb a power, which was represented as so dan-

“gerous. In consequence of this *private negotia-*  
 “*tion*, we have reason to believe dispatches were  
 “forwarded from CHINSURA to BATAVIA, about  
 “the latter end of the year 1758, which pro-  
 “duced the armament in question.”

(I have made, you see, my quotations from the two Memorials extend beyond the present matter, to avoid the necessity of quoting from them again, when I come to one of your subsequent remarks.)

When the 3d and 4th paragraphs of my Memorial are compared *by the circle of your own acquaintance*, and the Public, with that from Governor CLIVE and his Council, and that presented by the Court of Directors, in the Name of the Company, to the King,—where, Sir, will you hide yourself from shame? What, Sir! let your arrows fly from the dark shades of ignorance and malice, and wound and arraign the veracity of your best friends! Lord CLIVE! and many of the respectable members of *the present Court of Directors*, who put their hands to the Memorial to the King; and for whom you are now an avowed champion!

You

You next attempt, p. 16 and 17, to invalidate my charge against the SUBAH for assassinating of COJA HADDEE and COSSIM ALI KHAN in 1758, and other officers known to be attached to the interest of the ENGLISH; (here let it be remembered, that these are the only assassinations that I produced in *my Memorial*) to refute these, or rather to apologize for them, you say, p. 16, in your Remarks,—“ The men here said to be put  
 “ to death for their attachment to us, had no  
 “ sort of connection with us;” not immediately, I grant; but their attachment to our interest was known and avowed: cause enough, witness ROY-DULLUB.—Your first apology for the SUBAH’s murder of the first named of these officers is, that “ a month or two before his death, he engaged in a project to introduce the FRENCH  
 “ by the means of one MUSTAPHA, &c.” This seems calculated, not only to extenuate the murder, but appears to be introduced chiefly to afford matter of slander against Mr. VANSITTART, who, you say, “ employed this MUSTAPHA as  
 “ his agent for his inland trade;” for immediately after, you contradict your first apology, and say,  
 “ The *real cause* of the SUBA’s displeasure was,  
 “ that they, with eleven others, set their hands

"to a paper mutually to support each other," (against the known tyranny and cruelty of the father and son, I suppose, if any such compact or association did really exist;) although it was known to the world these were only pretences; the true causes of their death were the SUBAH's jealousy of their declared attachment to us, and a greedy thirst after their possessions: the same might justly have been said regarding the murders of ABDEL ONAB KHAN, and YAR MAHOMET, which I should have particularized in my Memorial, if it had been my intention to inflame Mr. VANSITTART against the SUBAH's and MHIRAN's crimes,—as these murders were rather more atrocious and cruel than the others.—The former was way-laid, and assassinated by the SUBAH's order, on the ROMNAH, on pretence of a conspiracy, in March 1760.—The latter was cut to pieces in the presence of MHIRAN, in April 1760, because he had been a favourite of SURAJUD DOWLA, and was supposed to have large possessions.—

Page 17 of your remarks, after having disingenuously separated my 5th paragraph, and brought down part of it to the bottom of your page,

page, you begin a new paragraph, which alters my sense ; you imply an assertion for me which I never meant, and then profoundly say, “ This “ is void of all truth ; GOLOMSHAW was no re- “ lation of the SUBAH’s ; they were both offi- “ cers in his service, and revolted to the SHAW “ ZADDA.”——When my paragraph is connected together, it runs thus : “ To this purpose (of in- “ dependence) COJA HADDEE, and COSSIM ALI “ KHAN 1st and 2d BUXY, were assassinated in No- “ vember and December 1758, after many attempts “ on the persons of RHEIM KHAN, and GOLAM “ SHAW his uncle and brother ; they were ob- “ liged to seek an asylum with the SHAW ZADDA.” Whose uncle and brother could I possibly mean ? COSSIM ALI KHAN was the last person named ; and therefore, if you had not designedly mangled my paragraph, it must plainly read, RHEIM KHAN *was uncle to COSSIM ALI, and GOLAM SHAW was his brother* ; for I know as well as you that he was no relation to the SUBAH.—Fy ! Sir,—these are little arts unworthy a man.

In your remark upon my assertion, “ *that Roy- “ DULLOB and his four brothers were proscribed,*” you give me and the public a very striking proof of the

the regard you have for truth; people that delight in story-telling, they say, ought to have good memories.—Page 18, of your Remarks, you say, “ This proscription was *nothing more than* dismissing “ them from their employments, and they are “ all alive at this time.” Please, Sir, to return back to the 4th page of this correct and authentic piece of yours, and see what words follow your *crisis*,—“ *And the SUBAH’s forces were on the point “ of attacking him (ROYDULLOB) when we finding “ the SUBAH could not be reconciled to him con- “ formable to our agreement, took him under “ our protection, and sent him to CALCUTTA.*”—Here it is evident from your own words, that had we not most critically stepped in, ROYDULLUB and his brothers would have been *dismissed from their employments* with a vengeance!—Why, Sir, would you thus wantonly provoke me to the necessity of exposing you?

Your next remark (page 18) regards OMHIR BEG KHAN: “ This man (you say) quitted the “ country because he had no confidence in any one “ but Lord CLIVE,” in contradiction to my assertion, that nothing could have preserved him (for his most remarkable attachment to the English) but  
his

his engaging his word to quit the kingdom.—This I know, that Governor CLIVE was, for some days before OMHIR BEG KHAN's arrival in CALCUTTA, in hourly expectation of hearing that he was cut off by MHIRAN. To the reason for his safety given in my memorial, I believe I might have added the SOUBAH's dread of Colonel CLIVE's severe resentment; for the Colonel highly regarded OMHIR BEG, as did every man in the settlement who had any knowledge of him: I attended the governor on a visit to him a few days before he embarked; he was then in a miserable state of health, and most pathetically lamented the necessity he was reduced to, and that he was not permitted quietly to embrace a death that was inevitable from the nature of his disease.

I come now, Sir, (page 18 and 19) to your laboured apology for the SOUBAH, against my charge of his “introducing by secret negociation the Dutch armament:”—but why should I arrogate so much to myself as to call it *my charge*? it is the charge of Governor CLIVE and his council; it is the charge of the court of Directors of the year 1764, founded on the honour, faith, and veracity of Governor CLIVE and his council, who must be deemed the only, and competent judges of the transaction.

transaction:—You say, at the beginning of your apology, “ That the whole of this charge amounts “ to no more than a suspicion, &c.” Is it possible to believe that Governor CLIVE and his council would exhibit a charge of this nature on suspicion only? or that the Company, in their memorial to the King, would have taken it up upon no better evidence?—Does not Mr. BISHOP’s letter to the SUBAH (Appendix, N<sup>o</sup> 6. page 55.) expressly say, “ *We sent for the said army in consequence of your disorders* ;” let me add Lord CLIVE’s confirmation of the company’s memorial in his Lordship’s own words; (Appendix, N<sup>o</sup> 13. page 71.) “ This “ is to certify, that I have *carefully perused* the annexed memorial of the ENGLISH EAST INDIA “ Company to his Majesty, and do *solemnly declare*, “ that such of the facts therein mentioned as I was “ any ways concerned in, *are truly stated*, and that “ *I verily believe* the rest to be so.

“ CLIVE.”

Here I might repeat the unanswerable arguments I had occasion to publish before, in defence of this charge against the SUBAH, but shall content myself with referring to them only (page 102. of Ind. Tr.)—The whole of your apology  
(founded

(founded on the conjectural motives that led the SUBAH to introduce another EUROPEAN force to *oppose ours*, that he might preserve the balance of power in his own hands) any one but yourself would surely blush to own; could he “have expressed a desire” of this kind, without a flagrant breach of the treaty subsisting between us? but he not only *expressed*, but carried his desire into execution.—You say, (page 19.) “that when the “DUTCH armament did arrive, he acted the most “honourable part imaginable.”—You chuse not to account for this change, therefore I will, and take the words of the Company’s memorial to the King (page 9.) After speaking of the advance of the SHAW ZADDA with a numerous army early in the year 1759, it goes on, “whereupon Governor “CLIVE, not regarding, though well apprised of “the ingratitude with which the NIZAM was half “inclined to return the obligations conferred on “him, readily marched to PATNA in his defence, “to which he owed his deliverance from a danger “that must otherwise have overwhelmed him. “This was such an instance of fidelity and attachment on the part of the ENGLISH, as made him “*much ashamed* of having listened to any insinuations to the contrary.”—Here, Sir, for the first

time, I will make a concession to you; that there was a manifest change in the mind of the SUBAH between the period he stipulated for the introduction of the DUTCH armament, and that of their arrival, I will most readily acknowledge. Conscious ingratitude stared him in the face! Vengeance for breach of his solemn treaty with us, hung over him! and I dare say, he would have given half his Subaship, could he have recalled the engagements he had entered into the preceding year: that was impossible; so he had nothing left for it, but to temporise between the two powers, and deceive them both if he could.

You add at the close of your remark (page 19.) that “when the DUTCH commenced hostilities, he sent his son with a body of forces to join us;” but you know, Sir, they never did join us, and you know *the reason* why they did not, but that you chuse to suppress:—This reason is manifested in Governor CLIVE’s and his council’s memorial, in nearly the following terms; “On this event (the “DUTCH commencing hostilities) we concluded “with the greatest probability, that the DUTCH “had received intelligence of a rupture between “them and us in EUROPE, or *that they were sure* “of

“ of the NIZAM’s joining them, or of his standing  
 “ neuter at least; and having the utmost reason to sus-  
 “ pect the NIZAM’s whole conduct, Governor CLIVE  
 “ advised him of the acts of violence the DUTCH  
 “ had committed below, adding, that as they had  
 “ commenced actual war against us, he should  
 “ judge the quarrel now subsisted between them  
 “ and us only, desiring he would desist from send-  
 “ ing his son or any part of his army to our assist-  
 “ ance.” Thus it is clear, Governor CLIVE  
 thought that neither the NIZAM, nor his son, nor  
 his troops, were at that critical juncture to be  
 trusted; and these were likewise the sentiments of  
 his whole council.

Page 20 contains only one remark of fulsome  
 adulation, the merit of which (if there is any merit  
 in it) is not your own; “ Lord CLIVE’s rule of con-  
 “ duct was, a rigid regard to all engagements.” This  
 profound anecdote, is obviously advanced as a con-  
 trast to my conduct, and arose from the following  
 short paragraph of my memorial, INDIA TRACTS,  
 page 10.

“ The Prince more than once wrote to the Co-  
 “ lonel, offering any terms for the Company and  
 “ himself, on conditions the ENGLISH would quit  
 “ the

“ the SUBAH, and join his arms ; but the Colone,  
 “ thinking it *incompatible with our alliance*, gave  
 “ the Prince no encouragement.”—Here I might  
 very justly have added, that it was also *incompatible*  
 with the recent very high obligations the Colonel  
 lay under to the SUBAH’s generosity, otherwise his  
 conduct appears unaccountable that he did not de-  
 pose the SUBAH after the campaign in 1759, upon  
 the full conviction he owns he had of his treachery  
 and breach of the treaty in the negociation for the  
 DUTCH armament.

I have now followed you, Sir, through all your  
 dirt and rubbish, to your last formal attack, where  
 you resume the refutation of my charge of the assassi-  
 nations, supported, as you think, by the foreign auxi-  
 liary force of Lord CLIVE’s letter and certificate of  
 some of those people being still alive : however, the  
 murders of COJAH HADDEE, COSSIM ALI KHAN,  
 ABDEL OHAB KHAN, and YAR MAHOMET, as well  
 as the intended assassination of ROYDULLUB, are  
 still uncontested ; these continue sufficient vouchers  
 of the SUBAH’s and his son’s cruelties, and there  
 is no certificate of the first named four being  
 alive pretended *as yet*.—Let us see, upon a  
 fair discussion, how far your foreign aid will  
 affect us : in order to which, I will beg leave  
 to transcribe the part of his Lordship’s letter  
 which

which you have given us, page 23. “ I desire it may be known, *for the honour of JAFFIER ALI KHAN*, that the murders ascribed to him in *Mr. HOLWELL’S memorial*, are *cruel aspersions*, and *void of all truth*, for they are all now living, *except the two last*, who were put to death by *MHIRAN*, unknown to his father.”—If this letter is genuine, (of which, in compliment to his Lordship, I confess some doubt) it is at least something difficult to be understood, although the general tendency of it is plain enough; but what does his Lordship mean when he excepts *the two last* put to death by *MHIRAN*? *Mr. HOLWELL’S memorial* contains but a charge of *two murders first and last*, and those you have murdered as well as I, and assigned the pretended causes for their being put to death; or does his Lordship mean *ABDEL OHAB KHAN* and *YAR MAHOMET*? If so, between you both you have authenticated my list of four assassinations: or perhaps he means the two last of my list, following *Mr. HASTINGS’S letter* to me, of the 21st June, (*Ind. Tr. 2d Ed. page 41.*) if so, we have two more to add to the assassination-account *authenticated*.—In truth, as his Lordship’s very ill founded attack on my character is confined solely *to my memorial*, I am utterly at a loss to comprehend him; but you, Sir, I can perfectly comprehend, and plainly see you will stick at nothing to satiate your little malice.

lice. — In your remarks, page 22. you think proper to give the last two or three lines of Mr. HASTINGS's letter just mentioned, and suppress all the foregoing parts as well as my short letter that occasioned that reply, because you plainly saw they both contained matter tending to my justification, and flattered yourself they might not be adverted to by the public; this obliges me to transcribe them here.

“ TO MR. WARREN HASTINGS.

“ SIR,

13 June, 1760.

“ *By express yesterday from DACCA we have ad-*  
 “ *vice, that the SUBAH had taken off ALIVERDY's*  
 “ *and SHAW AMET KHAN's BEGUMS.*——He sent  
 “ a JEMMAUTDAAR and 100 horse, with orders  
 “ to JESSURAUT KHAN (then NABOB of DACCA)  
 “ to carry this bloody scheme into execution, with  
 “ separate orders to the JEMMAUTDAAR, in case  
 “ JESSURAUT KHAN refused obedience: he refused  
 “ acting any part in the tragedy, and left it to the  
 “ other, who carried them out by night about two  
 “ miles above the city in a boat, tied weights to  
 “ their legs, and throwed them overboard: they  
 “ struggled for some time, and held by the gun-  
 “ wal of the boat, but by strokes on their heads  
 “ with

“ with latties (staves) and cutting their hands, they  
 “ sunk.—These are the acts of the tyger we are  
 “ supporting and fighting for. I am, Sir, &c.”

To this letter Mr. HASTINGS returned the following answer, dated MORADBOUGH, 21st June, 1760, six days at least after the receipt of mine.

“ SIR,

“ The relation transmitted to me, in your letter  
 “ of the 13th, of the murder of the two BEGUMS;  
 “ filled me with horror and astonishment; but how  
 “ were those sensations increased, when I was told  
 “ *that not only the two wretched sufferers abovementioned,*  
 “ *but the whole family, to the number of nine*  
 “ *persons, had undergone the same fate.* I will not  
 “ mention their names until I have undoubted  
 “ proofs of the truth of my intelligence, which I  
 “ wish (though I cannot expect it) I may find not  
 “ so bad at last *as is represented to me.* How this  
 “ circumstance escaped my knowledge, I know  
 “ not; it was not indeed an event to be learned  
 “ from inquiry; and possibly the infamy of the  
 “ fact might have made my friends who were in  
 “ the secret neglect to speak to me on a subject,  
 “ which, from our particular connections with the

“ NABOB,

“ NABOB, and his intire dependence on our power,  
 “ *could not but reflect dishonour on the ENGLISH name.*  
 “ I have hitherto been generally an advocate for the  
 “ NABOB, whose *extorsions* and *oppressions*, I im-  
 “ puted to the necessity of the times, and want  
 “ of œconomy in his revenues; but if, &c.”

The spirited, just, and pathetic conclusion of the paragraph, you have already given.—I set forth, page 41. before referred to, that “ The advices sent  
 “ from DACCA, touching these murders, were dis-  
 “ patched immediately on the rumour of the deed;  
 “ and from thence, as usual, imperfect; *subsequent*  
 “ *advices* brought the true state of the execution  
 “ as follows:”

“ GOSSETA BEGUM, widow of SHAW AMET  
 “ JUNG:

“ EMNA BEGUM, mother to SURAJAH DOWLA,  
 “ and widow to GEYNDE AMET:

“ MORAD DOWLA KHAN, the son of PATSHA  
 “ KOOLY KHAN, adopted son of SHAW AMET  
 “ JUNG:

“ LUTSEN NESSA BEGUM, widow of SURAJAH  
 “ DOWLA;

“ Her infant daughter, by SURAJAH DOWLA.”

The advices from DACCA said, these perished with about twenty of their women. Mr. VANSITTART'S intelligence says, about seventy.—Mr. HASTINGS'S information says, nine persons, being the whole of the family, without specifying the number of the inferior women; but all accounts agreed, that ALIVERDI'S BEGUM escaped the massacre of her whole family.

Whether this charge laid against the SUBAH be true or false, I have made it sufficiently manifest it came from DACCA by express from our gentlemen there resident, on the very scene of action; the words of my letter to Mr. HASTINGS minutely corresponded with the terms of the express, without the least exaggeration; *the subsequent advices* from DACCA confirmed their former intelligence, and forwarded particulars. Mr. HASTINGS replies six days after the receipt of mine, and upon enquiry is informed, the number of the family murdered exceeds the DACCA advices:—If my veracity is doubted, regarding the express from DACCA, I appeal to WILLIAM MACQUIRE, Esq; then a member of the Select Committee, and to CULLING SMITH, Esq; then secretary to the Select Committee, both now in ENGLAND, to declare whether those advices did, or did not arrive from

Dacca about the time, and to the purpose which I have alleged.—Indeed the rankest of my enemies would hardly believe I could be so weak, as well as wicked, to tell Mr. HASTINGS, then in the public situation of the *Company's Resident*, That “*By express yesterday from DACCA, we have advised, &c.*” if no such express and advice had been received.

On the whole I say, that supposing the charge against the SUBAH “*cruel aspersions, and void of all truth,*” they were no aspersions of mine; as his Lordship would have found, had he (as in equity and honour bound, before he made so free with any Gentleman's character) traced this charge to its rise.—I allow his Lordship has powerful and interesting motives for *defending* “*the honour of JAFFIER ALY KHAN;*” but motives of another kind, motives of *impartial justice*, should have checked his zeal in the present instance: for as the fact stands, in place of my having aspersed the SUBAH, his Lordship has, without any real cause or foundation, loaded *me with a cruel aspersion, void of all truth*, if (as I said before) the paragraph you give the Public from his Lordship's letter be genuine.

I have

I have hitherto proceeded on the supposition that this charge against the SOUBAH is false, but I will now beg leave to lay before the Public my reasons for still believing it true. In the first place, it can hardly be conceived, that a charge should be so minutely and circumstantially laid by gentlemen on the spot, without foundation. Secondly, the charge (heavy and cruel as it was, if not true) was never contradicted, during my stay in INDIA, by any advices from DACCA or elsewhere; nor since, that I have heard, until very lately. Thirdly, For that I find Lord CLIVE founds his judgment and censure upon the address to him of the 10th December, 1765, and the list annexed to it, page 24 and 25 of your pamphlet; neither of which invalidates the charge, but only shews his Lordship was deceived by here and there the similarity of names: but one in the list corresponds with the names transmitted from DACCA, viz. MORAUD UL DOWLA, who calls himself the son of JEERAM UL DOWLA; whereas the MORAD DOWLA, mentioned in the DACCA express, was incontestably the son of PATSHA KOOLEE KHAN. Neither the address or list make any mention of GOSSETA BEGUM, widow of SHAW AMET JUNG; nor of EMNA BEGUM, the mother of SURAJAH DOWLA.—The widow of ALIVERDY may be living,

ing, she is said to have escaped the slaughter.— The wife and daughter of SURAJAH DOWLA have a place in the address, by the name of SHOOKA BOLLA CAWN; whereas the DACCA advices call her LUTSEN NESSA BEGUM: SURAJAH DOWLA probably had two wives and two daughters, which reconciles the difference. The real fact appears to be this, that almost all the list of prisoners released by his Lordship are the family of SURAJAH DOWLA and SIRFERAZ KHAN, who we all know were imprisoned many years at DACCA, and not the family of ALIVERDY KHAN, charged by the advices to have been cut off by JAFFIER KHAN, in June 1760; but be they one or other, or partly each, and be the charge against the SUBAH *true* or *false*, it affects not me in any shape, as I have demonstrably proved.

Here I must remark, that although you set out with impeaching my whole Memorial of *falsehood* or *misrepresentation in every instance*, yet you think proper to drop it before you have gone through one third; for this I believe you had very cogent reasons.—The remainder of it you make short work with; and being determined to close with as little good breeding as you began, you  
say,

say, page 26. " The rest of this Memorial needs  
 " no comment; but here I shall observe, that  
 " most of what Mr. HOLWELL has published, is  
 " entitled to equal credit with this Memorial."  
 That you intended me no compliment in this con-  
 clusion, is pretty plain; but you inadvertently pay  
 me the highest you could possibly devise: for as I  
 have *generally*, in my Answer to the EAST INDIA  
 OBSERVER, N<sup>o</sup> 6. and *minutely* here, detected, ex-  
 posed, and refuted, beyond the reach of cavil, all  
 your shameful superficial attacks and insinuations  
 against my Memorial, I will not doubt, but from  
 the candor of the Public, and even from *the circle*  
*of your own acquaintance*, I shall be entitled to an  
 equal degree of credit regarding my other publi-  
 cations; I desire it only in proportion as I have sup-  
 ported (*in every instance*) my veracity in that of my  
 Memorial.

I now, Sir, take my leave of you——assuring  
 you most faithfully, that be your provocations in  
 future what they will, I shall never more think  
 you worth my notice, *in this way*, at least.

J. Z. HOLWELL.

BEENHIM-HOUSE,

BERKS, 24th Jan. 1767.

Lately published, the Second Edition, revised,  
and corrected with Additions.

## INDIA TRACTS:

By Mr. HOLWELL and Friends.

CONTAINING,

- I. An Address to the Proprietors of *East India* Stock; setting forth, the unavoidable Necessity, and real Motives for the Revolution in *Bengal*, 1760.
- II. A Refutation of a Letter from certain Gentlemen of the Council at *Bengal*, to the Honourable the secret Committee.
- III. Important Facts regarding the *East-India* Company's Affairs in *Bengal*, from the Years 1752 to 1760, with Copies of several very interesting Letters.
- IV. A Narrative of the deplorable Deaths of the *English* Gentlemen who were suffocated in the *Black-Hole* in *Fort William*, at *Calcutta*, June 1756.
- V. A Defence of Mr. *Vansittart's* Conduct, illustrated with a Frontispiece, representing the Monument erected at *Calcutta*, in Memory of the Sufferers in the *Black-Hole* Prison.

*Also by the same Author,*

INTERESTING HISTORICAL EVENTS, relative to the Provinces of *Bengal* and *Indostan*. Two parts, with Cuts.

Printed for T. BECKET and P. A. DE HONDT,  
near *Surry-Street*, in the Strand.







UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY  
Los Angeles

This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

REC'D LD-URL

LD-URL

MAY 6

1968

MAY

6 1968

Form L9-32m-8,'58(5876s4)444

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA



3 1158 01025 1014

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



A 000 017 675 0

